

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21-24 are currently pending.
- Claims 1, 9, 12, 17 and 21-24 are amended herein.

Support for Amendments

Claim 1 was amended to recite, “erasing said root certificate from said computing device operatively coupled to said smartcard in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available” and is supported by locations in the specification including FIG. 2 and block 406 of FIG. 4. Other independent claims have amendments that are supported in similar locations in the specification.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Hamann:** Hamann et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0026578
- **Dancs:** Dancs et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,108,789
- **Skomora:** Skomora et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076198
- **Palaniswamy:** Palaniswamy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,951,095

Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21-24 are Non-Obvious over Hamann in view of Dancs, Skomora and Palaniswamy

Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Hamann in view of Dancs, Skomora and Palaniswamy. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration in view of the remarks herein.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

determining when said smartcard is no longer operatively available to the computing device; and

erasing said root certificate from said computing device operatively coupled to said smartcard in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available.

Amendments to claim 1 to clarify that the erased root certificate is erased from a “computing device operatively coupled to [a] smartcard in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available.” Such erasure within memory of a device operatively coupled to a smartcard—in response to a determination of smartcard unavailability—is not taught or suggested by the documents of record.

The Hamann document was cited as alleged disclosing reading a root certificate from a smart card. At paragraph [0046], Hamann describes that “the application obtains the certificate from the smart card.” However, as the Office notes on Page 4 of the OA mailed 06/24/2010, Hamann “does not directly disclose” erasing a root certificate from a computing device.

The Dancs document was cited as allegedly disclosing a password requirement. At column 7 lines 23-40 Dancs describes a client device that checks to see if a smart card is inserted in a slot. Upon detection of the smartcard, the user is challenged for a PIN or password. However, as the Office notes on Page 4 of the OA mailed 06/24/2010, Dancs “does not directly disclose” erasing a root certificate from a computing device.

The Skomra document was cited as determining if a smartcard is no longer operatively available to the computing device. At paragraph [0114], Skomra describes that removal of a smartcard means that the user endpoint device no longer has the signed user’s certificate, and therefore is an unauthorized user endpoint device. However, the Office does not suggest that Skomra teaches or suggests the limitation of an erasing step. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Skomra does not teach or suggest erasing a root certificate from a computing device.

The Palaniswamy document was cited as disclosing erasing of a root certificate from a computer memory. Applicant respectfully submits that Palaniswamy instead describes erasure/deletion of a root certificate residing on a smartcard and/or SIM (subscriber identity module), and fails to teach or suggest erasing said root certificate from said computing device, as recited by claim 1, as amended.

Palaniswamy repeatedly discloses that the certificate is in a SIM or smartcard, not in memory of a computer operatively coupled to a smartcard. For example, Palaniswamy discloses at the Abstract (emphasis added):

The system and methods described provide processes for determining **whether a Subscriber Entity Module (SIM) is present with a digital certificate** for a domain of an administrator, e.g., a network

operator, for designating administrative responsibilities in a mobile communications device.

And further, in column 6, lines 4-12, Palaniswamy discloses a certificate is on the SIM card (emphasis added):

At step 42 the system determines whether the user is the administrator, and the presence of the certificate is checked out at step 44. If a certificate is present 46 and the certificate owner wants to be a temporary administrator 48, **the user is queried at step 48 to allow the certificate on the SIM to take temporary control** (step 50 discussed below) of the trusted third party domain. By temporary control, it is meant that once the card is removed, the administrator reverts back to the user administrator settings.

Also in column 6, at lines 14-17, Palaniswamy discloses a certificate on the SIM card (emphasis added):

If the user disallows **the SIM certificate**, the TTP domain cannot use any of the network abilities in the trusted third party domain at step 52.

Referring to FIG. 3 of Palaniswamy, it can be seen that the certificate is found on the SIM. At decision blocks 44 and 58, it is determined if the certificate is on the SIM. If the certificate is not found on the SIM, it does not exist (see blocks 54 and 60).

Accordingly, Palaniswamy discloses the use of a certificate within a SIM or smartcard type device, but fails to teach or suggest “erasing [a] root certificate from said computing device operatively coupled to [a] smartcard in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available,” as recited by claim 1, as amended.

However, the Office suggests that Palaniswamy, at column 3 (lines 34-67) and column 6 (lines 4-67), teaches “erasing said root certificate.” Specifically, the Patent office points to column 3, and suggests that Palaniswamy teaches erasing said root certificate from said computing device. For example, column 3 line 37 recites aspects of deletion of a root certificate. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Palaniswamy fails to teach or suggest that a root certificate is located on, and is therefore erased from, a computing device. Instead, column 3 discloses that the root certificate resides on the SIM card (see column 3 lines 52-53).

The Patent office also points to column 6, and suggests that Palaniswamy teaches erasing said root certificate from said computing device. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that all of the certificates discussed in the Palaniswamy reference generally, and in column 6 particularly, are located on a smartcard or SIM. Therefore, the Applicant submits that Palaniswamy does not teach the use of certificates located on a computing device. Moreover, Palaniswamy fails to teach erasing such root certificates from the computing device in response to determining a smartcard is no longer operatively available.

Column 6 makes numerous references to a certificate on a SIM (*e.g.*, column 6, lines 8, 15, 22, 27, 35, 35, 56 and 57). For example, at column 6 lines 25-30, Palaniswamy discloses that if a SIM is present, a check is performed to see if a certificate is present. Additionally, column 6 describes the workings of the flow chart of FIG. 3. As noted above, FIG. 3 discloses determining if the certificate is on the SIM in two locations (blocks 44 and 58).

Applicant respectfully submits that, at least in view of the amendment, Palaniswamy fails to teach or suggest “erasing said at least one root certificate from said computing device in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available” as recited.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Hamann, Dancs, Skomora and Palaniswamy does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 1.

Independent Claim 9

Claim 9, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

determining when said smartcard is no longer operatively available;
and

erasing said root certificate in said device coupled to said smartcard in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available

In view of the amendments, claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and the remarks from above are incorporated by reference at this location.

Dependent Claim 12

Claim 12 ultimately depends from independent claim 9. As discussed above, claim 9 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 12 is also allowable

over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that it recites.

Independent Claim 17

Claim 17, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

to determine when said smartcard is no longer operatively available, and **erase said root certificate in said certificate store in said computer memory of said computing device, in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available**

In view of the amendments, claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and the remarks from above are incorporated by reference at this location.

Dependent Claims 19

Claim 19 ultimately depends from independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 19 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that it recites.

Independent Claim 21

Claim 21, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

determining when said smartcard is no longer operatively available to the computing device; and

erasing said root certificate from said computing device operatively coupled to said smartcard in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available.

In view of the amendments, claim 21 is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and the remarks from above are incorporated by reference at this location.

Dependent Claims 22

Claim 22 ultimately depends from independent claim 21. As discussed above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 22 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that it recites.

Independent Claim 23

Claim 23, recites, in part (with emphasis added):

determining when said smartcard is no longer operatively available to the computing device; and

erasing said at least one root certificate from said computing device having computer memory operatively coupled to said smartcard memory in response to determining that said smartcard is no longer operatively available.

In view of the amendments, claim 23 is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and the remarks from above are incorporated by reference at this location.

Dependent Claims 24

Claim 24 ultimately depends from independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 24 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that it recites.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/David S. Thompson 37954/

Dated: 24 Nov 2010

David S. Thompson
(davidt@leehayes.com; 509-944-4735)
Registration No. 37954

David A. Divine
(Daved@leehayes.com; 509-944-4733)
Registration No. 51275